| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | 09/484,964 | YEH, EDWARD T. H. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Anne Marie S. Wehbe | 1633 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: amendment after non-final | | |
| (1) Anne Marie S. Wehbe. | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Gina Shishima</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 17 August 2006 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: rejections/objections of claims 88 and 98 | | |
| Claims discussed: 88 and 98 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: | | |
| Part III. | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| ANNE M. WEHBE' PH.D PRIMARY EXAMINER | | |
| (Examinar SPE Signature) (Applicant/ | Applicant's Representative Sig | gnature – if appropriate) |